Volume LXXXIII CHICAGO, May 22, 1919 Number 12

UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918

Men think there are circumstances when one may deal with human beings without love; and there are no such circumstances. One may deal with things without love; one may cut down trees, make bricks, hammer iron without love; but you cannot deal with men without it, just as men cannot deal with bees without being careful. If you deal carelessly with bees you will injure them, and will yourself be injured. And so with men. It cannot be otherwise, because natural love is the fundamental law of human life. It is true that a man cannot force another to love him, as he can force him to work for him; but it does not follow that a man may deal with men without love, especially to demand anything from them. If you feel no love, sit still, occupy yourself with things, with yourself, with anything you like, only not with men. You can only eat without injuring yourself when you feel inclined to eat, so you can only deal with men usefully when you love. Only let yourself deal with a man without love and there are no limits to the suffering you will bring on yourself.

—*Tolstoy.*

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL—
Notes 135
"The Labor that I had Labored to Do."—FRANCIS NEILSON 137

THE PULPIT—
The Community Church. II.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 139

CONTRIBUTED—
Missing—JAMES WALDO FAWCETT 138
Justice or Compromise?—RICHARD CLAUGHTON 141
News from Europe.—FRANCIS NEILSON 142

POETRY—
Years of the Modern.—*Walt Whitman* 135
The Last Spring.—THOMAS S. JONES, JR. 138

THE FIELD—
The Hundredth Anniversary Walt Whitman Fellowship in Chicago 143
First Unitarian Society, Spokane, Wash 143
"Too Near Europe" 143

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

$2.00 PER ANNUM

ESTABLISHED 1878

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices.

EDITORS

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1. March 1, 1878. No. 1.

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Robertz, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
George W. Nasmyth
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICACO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office:

28 E. Jackson Blvd.

CHICAGO

KENWOOD FLORAL CO.

HENRY HILMERS, Prop.

Choice Plants and Cut Flowers

Phone Oakland 78. 1117 East 47th Street

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

1902—One Wagon

1911—10 Wagons

and

FOUR AUTOMOBILES

We are patronized by those who desire and appreciate an excellent quality of laundry work.

Bissell Laundry Co.

Phone Douglas 1003

653-59 39th Street Chicago

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXIII. THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1919 NUMBER 12

YEARS OF THE MODERN.

Years of the modern! years of the unperform'd!
Your horizon rises, I see it parting away for more august dramas,
I see not America only, not only Liberty's nation but other nations preparing,
I see tremendous entrances and exits, new combinations, the solidarity of races,
I see that force advancing with irresistible power on the world's stage,
(Have the old forces, the old wars, played their parts? are the acts suitable to them closed?)
I see Freedom, completely arm'd and victorious and very haughty, with Law on one side and Peace on the other,
A stupendous trio all issuing forth against the idea of caste;
What historic denouements are these we so rapidly approach?
I see men marching and countermarching by swift millions,
I see the frontiers and boundaries of the old aristocracies broken,
I see the landmarks of European kings removed,
I see this day the People beginning their landmarks (all others give way);
Never were such sharp questions ask'd as this day,
Never was average man, his soul, more energetic, more like a God,
Lo, how he urges and urges, leaving the masses no rest!
His daring foot is on land and sea everywhere, he colonizes the Pacific, the archipelagoes,
With the steamship, the electric telegraph, the newspaper, the wholesale engines of war,
With these and the world-spreading factories he interlinks all geography, all lands;
What whispers are these O lands, running ahead of you, passing under the seas?
Are all nations communing? is there going to be but one heart to the globe?
Is humanity forming en-masse? for lo, tyrants tremble, crowns grow dim,
The earth restive, confronts a new era, perhaps a general divine war,
No one knows what will happen next, such portents fill the days and nights;
Years prophetical! the space ahead as I walk, as I vainly try to pierce it, is full of phantoms,
Unborn deeds, things soon to be, project their shapes around me,
This incredible rush and heat, this strange ecstatic fever of dreams O years!
Your dreams O years, how they penetrate through me! (I know not whether I sleep or wake);
The perform'd America and Europe grow dim, retiring in shadow behind me,
The unperform'd, more gigantic than ever, advance, advance upon me.

—*Walt Whitman.*

Comment on the Terms of Peace with Germany may well be postponed until the treaty has been submitted to the Senate, and the President has had opportunity of stating his interpretation of its meaning. Meanwhile it cannot be amiss to point out that even the most blood-thirsty of our German-haters were astonished at the drastic conditions imposed upon the German people; that the British Labor Party and the French Socialists have emphatically denounced the settlement; and that out of Germany are coming not only the inevitable stories of popular indignation, but the clearest evidences of a movement of revolt, which means a struggle for control between reactionaries and Spartacides, with implacable hostility to the Allies in either case. Still more significant is the ill-concealed satisfaction of the French government over what has been accomplished. From the beginning Premier Clemenceau and his associates have had but one idea as regards the outcome of the War, and that is "Victory!" The reconciliation of such idea with President Wilson's ideal of "peace without victory," and his formulation of this ideal in the famous "fourteen points," has all along been known to be impossible. There must be a settlement either in the terms of the old European diplomacy, with its indemnities, annexations and ferocious hatreds, or else in the terms of a new statesmanship which saw in the war "no quarrel with the German people," and in the peace only an opportunity to "vindicate the principles of justice in the life of the world!" President Wilson may be able to demonstrate that he has "met" the imperialists, and that they are his; but if so, every instinctive reaction of men to the situation at this moment, is wrong. Could anything be more illuminating than the suggestion, freely offered by defenders of the Treaty, that, had the Kaiser been victorious, he would have imposed terms much more terrible than anything contained in the Paris document? Is it possible that "the champions of the rights of mankind" have actually fallen so low that they are content to have their standards and accomplishments measured by those of the late Imperial German Government?

J. H. H.

It is well to understand that involved in this vast problem of the peace settlement is a question infinitely more important than any issue of indemnities, or boundary lines, or mandatories, or all of these issues put together. This question is none other than the moral question as to whether any good can come out of such a combat of arms as this which has devastated Europe during the last four years. It is no longer a question of good, adequate to bring compensation for millions of lives lost on the field of battle, other millions lost by famine, pestilence and massacre, vast territories ravaged, untold wealth wasted and destroyed, hatreds sown far and wide, and the spirit of man brutalized for generations to come! We know now that such compensation is impossible; not even

the maddest militarist would assert today anything other than that mankind is a loser on the whole from this devastating conflict of arms. But is it to be a total loss? Is there no good of any kind to be secured? Here is the real question now before the world. The Paris Conference has been engaged in a task of salvage, that is all. And now that the peace terms are before us, we are soon to know whether anything has been saved or not! J. H. H.

It is a satisfaction to discover that Dr. W. E. Orchard is not the only distinguished English clergyman who is pleading for the release of "conscientious objectors." A letter from London, published in the May issue of *The World Tomorrow,* quotes a notable passage from a sermon recently preached by Dr. John Henry Jowett, well known in this country as the minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York. "It ought to be possible," he said, "to find a tribunal that can distinguish between treachery and principle. This is not a day when England can afford to shut her consciences in prison. There are men now in prison serving long terms at hard labor before whom I would take off my hat, and they are placed alongside of life-long criminals, often in solitary confinement. A tribunal can be found which will discriminate between the coward seeking shelter from danger and the idler refusing to share the burden of the task, and the men—with martyrs' blood in their veins—who suffer because of their conscience. I would be false to myself and to my congregation if I failed to urge immediate action by our government looking toward their release." Dr. Jowett honors himself and his church by this appeal. How many non-pacifist clergymen are there in America who have similarly spoken? Where is there even one of the distinction and influence of Dr. Jowett? J. H. H.

Kerensky's "apologia," just published under the title of "The Prelude to Bolshevism," throws interesting light on the vexed problem of the relation of the Allies to the Russian revolution in the early days of 1917. Evidences have been multiplying that the Allied governments didn't understand this political overturn, were afraid of it, were hostile to it. Kerensky's testimony overwhelmingly confirms this judgment. Very soon after the moderate Socialists came to power in Russia, the Cossack commander, Korniloff, started his rebellion. A true patriot himself, this officer was the unwitting tool of those who lamented the passing of the Czar and desired his return. Instinctively the Russian people saw in him the menace of the restoration of everything which they feared and hated. "An adventure of a small group of men," writes Kerensky, "was transformed in the inflamed imagination of the masses to a conspiracy of the whole bourgeoisie and of all the upper classes against democracy and the working masses." With the result that the Bolsheviki, "who were impotent" up to this time, gained control of Petrograd, and "with lightning rapidity . . . overflowed the state"! And it was Korniloff, we now remember, who was backed by England and the Allies! This was perhaps the high-water mark of the tragedy of the Allied policy toward Russia during the last two years. If the Bolsheviki are now in control, the Allies have nobody to blame but themselves, is Kerensky's message. And if we seek for the root of it all, do we not find it in what has been so evident in the War from the beginning, a fundamental distrust of democracy? J. H. H.

With the end of the War and the coming of peace, the Espionage Act will be automatically repealed. This law, however, has proved itself to be all too effective a weapon of coercion, for the reactionary classes to permit it to pass altogether. It cannot be re-enacted, for the reason that it is a war measure. But it is entirely possible, is it not, to pass some sort of a peace-time sedition act? Undoubtedly! Hence the movement now well under way for the passage of such a measure in the next Congress! The bill, as drafted, will probably continue the enlistment and recruiting sections, as well as the sedition clauses, of the present law. It is also planned to include clauses penalizing any language advocating the overthrow of the Government by violence, or intended to incite resistance to the constitution or the laws of the country. It is unnecessary to explain what an engine of tyranny such an act would be. The enforcement of the present Espionage law furnishes abundant evidence of oppression. The American people, if they preserve one atom of regard for their ancient liberties, will see that this proposed measure is defeated, and its sponsors at the first opportunity retired to private life. J. H. H.

The death of Professor Crawford H. Toy of Harvard, on May 12, marks the passing of a great scholar—one of the few men of the first rank contributed by America to the world of learning. Like so many of the eminent teachers at Harvard during the past forty years, he was a discovery of President Eliot; and his appointment in 1878 was one of the chief events which signalized the transformation of the Divinity School from a Unitarian to an undenominational institution of theology. His fame and influence as a teacher grew steadily through a generation, until he ranked easily with the leading European scholars in the field of Biblical criticism. His retirement a few years ago marked the completion of a great career. J. H. H.

"The Labor That I Had Labored to Do"

Seemingly, perhaps in reality, it is still true that in Europe they know not how to make a treaty of peace. The old saying that all treaties are treaties of war may hold good. Anyway, no one will deny the fact that the terms presented by the Allies to Germany are a strict fulfilment of the secret treaties. Let us not hoodwink ourselves by putting a gloss over the time limits in connection with the Saar Valley and the Italian claims. The terms are the terms of the secret treaties, and whoever desire to lay the flattering unction to their souls that severity has been in any way mitigated by one or two concessions may do so and take what comfort they can. But, on the other hand, all those people who have, through the terrible stress and brutality of this war, hoped for the triumph of Christian principles, will no doubt shudder when they are fully conscious of what the terms mean to posterity. Decent-minded folk, whether they live in the Shantung Valley, in Fiume, or, indeed, in any country where honorable business dealings are observed, will wonder what has happened to all the high-flown promises of statesmen and preachers given to the people during the carnage. The war of Christian folk against pagan Germany, the war to save Democracy, the war against a barbarous autocracy, the war of noble ideal against brutalizing influences, all these texts and numbers of others of like savor, are now exposed in all their hollowness and cruel hypocrisy. The precedents that we were always warned to consider, notably the German terms of 1870, and the wresting of the two provinces from France, where are they now? Alas, we have been stripped of our pretention and cant.

Now we are forced to ask ourselves what has happened to our champion? Where stands the man in whom we placed our faith when skeptics laughed at us? There was a time when it was exceedingly difficult for those who believed in the fairness and the fitness of the spoken word, to maintain their faith in the man whose name was an inspiration to the common people of crushed and bleeding Europe. No matter how little support was given to him by the people of his own land, he at any rate had, at one time, the masses of Europe at his back—an honor no other statesman ever enjoyed. And it was difficult then in our land to support him with zeal in the face of the bitter hostility of the partisan press and hysterical jingoes. Long before he delivered the speech which contained the fourteen points, it was no easy task for any American having knowledge of European affairs, to maintain in public that the President's speech to the Senate of January, 1917, laid down the only satisfactory bases for peace. That was the "peace without victory" speech. That was the speech that drew the masses of Europeans to his standard; it was the speech that heralded the fourteen points, delivered three months before America entered the war, when the Allies were in sore need of our military and naval aid.

Must we say that our champion has met at the hands of his European and Asiatic friends the most humiliating defeat a statesman ever suffered? It is hard, very hard, to realize what this means to the world. Let us no longer speak of a League of All Nations, now that we have terms destructive of every one of the fourteen points. Let us not talk of peace so long as the terms are a fulfilment of the secret treaties. Well might it be said that the "labor that I had labored to do" "was vanity and vexation of spirit."

Let us try to understand what has happened, because, as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow morning, we shall have all these trials to meet again. On looking back, we may remember the position as it was in September of last year, when the President spoke in New York during the fourth liberty loan. He then laid down very definite conditions as a basis for peace. He told us then that *"national purposes have fallen more and more into the background* and the common purpose of enlightened mankind has taken their place." He assured us that it was "a people's war, not a statesman's." Then we were to "recognize and accept the duty of a new day in which we are permitted *to hope for a general alliance which will avoid entanglements and clear the air of the world for common understanding and the maintenance of common rights."* He was emphatic in declaring that "the counsels of plain men have become on all hands more simple and straightforward and more unified than the counsels of sophisticated men of affairs, who still retain the impression that they are *playing the game of power and playing for high stakes."* Fine sentiments. No wonder the common folk of Europe rejoiced in the high principles of the President of the United States. We, at that time, ventured to prophesy that that speech would be the means of bringing hostilities to a close. When Prince Max of Baden became chancellor of the German Empire, we were certain that the old autocratic government was about to fall. Our prophecy was fulfilled, for on October 4th the President received a dispatch from the Germans requesting him "to take steps for the restoration of peace, to notify all belligerents of this request, and to invite them to delegate plenipotentiaries for the purpose of taking up negotiations." Further, the German government accepted "as a basis for peace negotiations the program laid down by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of January 8, 1918, and in his later pronouncements, especially in his address of September 27, 1918," adding that "in order to avoid further bloodshed the German government requests the President to bring about the immediate conclusion of an armistice on land, on

water, and in the air." After a great deal of correspondence between the belligerent powers, the President on November 5th sent a note to the German government in which it was stated:

> The Allied governments have given careful consideration to the correspondence which has passed between the President of the United States and the German Government. Subject to the qualifications which follow they declare their willingness to make peace with the Government of Germany on the terms of peace laid down in the President's address to Congress of January, 1918, and the principles of settlement enunciated in his subsequent addresses. They must point out, however, that clause two, relating to what is usually described as the freedom of the seas, is open to various interpretations, some of which they could not accept. They must, therefore, reserve to themselves complete freedom on this subject when they enter the peace conference.
>
> Further, in the conditions of peace laid down in his address to Congress of January 8, 1918, the President declared that invaded territories must be restored as well as evacuated and freed; the Allied governments feel that no doubt ought to be allowed to exist as to what this provision implies. By it they understand that compensation will be made by Germany for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allies and their property by the aggression of Germany by land, by sea and from the air.

Then the trouble began: the statesmen gave place to the military and naval representatives, and they drew up the terms of the armistice. Our faith was seriously shaken when the President relinquished his power to European militarists. Anyway, the terms that have been handed to the Germans, the German people with whom President Wilson had no quarrel, as he informed us, are not based upon the principles laid down by him, nor are they in any particular in accordance with those we have quoted above that were implicitly a condition of the peace negotiations which took place between him and the Germans in October last.

This is what has happened: America has been allied with Powers who have never been in sympathy with President Wilson's principles. We have had an alliance of two diametrically opposed sets of ideas. Indeed, the real war struggle has been centered here, not on the battlefield. The European Allies have fought from the first for political and commercial dominance, whereas America, it seemed, fought for the supremacy of international ideals. It was impossible from the first to hope for the true solution of this matter so long as the European Allies were pledged to one another to carry out their secret treaties. Have we not pointed out, several times, that the armies of occupation have had no other mission than that of carrying out the provisions of the secret treaties? But it is now futile to ask how the European Allies could agree to the President's principles of negotiation in October when they knew thoroughly well that they did not believe in them, could not carry them out, that territorial and commercial acquisition was the propelling force of their policy which united them.

Now this war that was to end war has set up the strongest alliance, under the provisions of the Paris Covenant, the world has ever known. The group system still obtains, for no general alliance has been formed. The old nefarious policy of creating spheres of influence is perpetuated. Finance and commerce are in that group more closely coördinated and organized than ever. And a League of All Nations is as remote from human practice as it was in July, 1914. The end of war is not yet; indeed, there are more wars going on today in Europe than at any other time. It is enough to make all mankind despair of statesmanship ever rising to the level of common political intelligence.

There is, however, something else to be considered. It is this: Will the people who have given their sons to the Moloch of war be satisfied with this result? Will they accept this in return for all the sacrifice, the agony, and the tears? What a horrible thought it is that would incline one to this belief! If it was "a people's war, not a statesmen's," then let us hope the statesmen's terms may be exchanged for a people's peace.

FRANCIS NEILSON.

THE LAST SPRING.

The first glad token of the Spring is here
  That bears each time one miracle the more,
  For in the sunlight is the golden ore,
The joyous promise of a waking year;
And in that promise all clouds disappear
  And youth itself comes back as once before,
  For only dreams are real in April's store
When buds are bursting and the skies are clear.
Fair Season! at your touch the sleeping land
  Quickens to rapture, and a rosy flame
    Is the old signal of awakening;
Thus in a mystery I understand
  The deepest meaning of your lovely name—
    How it will be in that perpetual Spring!

THOMAS S. JONES, JR.

Missing

There is no word in our war vocabulary more terribly meaningful than the word "missing." A soldier goes into action, takes part in some great battle,—and the report "missing" comes back to his dear ones, waiting at home. The word means nothing, and it also means everything. First of all it suggests the fact that when the regiment roll call was completed the soldier indicated was not present. It suggests that he may have been killed, or wounded and left upon the field to languish and die in ghastly agony. It suggests the possibility that he may have gone mad, or that he may have been captured by the enemy. In any case, its first implication is that of indefiniteness. It is negative in its meaning. Many weeks or months or even years may pass before any more exact information is available. And, of course, there are many occasions when the answer never comes. Imagine the anguish of the parents of the "missing"! Of wives and sweethearts and friends! And remember that there are 5,500 officers and men of the American Expeditionary Force still "missing" at this date. And 161,800 of the British forces. And 290,000 of the forces of France! Is not the word "missing" a splendid and terrible argument against war?

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

THE PULPIT

The Community Church

By John Haynes Holmes

II.

The first thing that I would note in any one of our regular churches today, is the fact that it is a denominational institution. As we walk the streets of any city or town, and look at the churches that we pass, we observe that this church is Methodist, that that church is Presbyterian, that this other church is Christian Science, and so on through all the long catalogue of denominations. Each church, in other words, is a representative of this community of a certain religious movement which had its origin in a more or less remote age, perhaps in a foreign country, and which has its headquarters in another city and sometimes even in another land. It stands here not as something which has grown up out of the community from within, as a spiritual expression of the community life, but as something which has been imposed upon the community from without, as an expression of a form of thought and a way of life which may be as alien as the philosophies of India or Peru. What has happened religiously a thousand times, in new communities established on the frontiers, or in new suburban or residential districts opened up on the outskirts of a great city, is an illustration of what I mean. Immediately, when the people have planted their homes in this community, the denominational representatives have arrived, along with the merchants and saloon keepers; and each one has set up his own particular place of ecclesiastical business, and started competition with his rivals for customers. And to the extent that he has succeeded in his work, he has drawn off little groups of people from the general life of the community, and identified them with interests which lie altogether outside the borders of the locality in which they live. The nearest that any one of these denominational churches has ever come to growing up naturally out of the community, is when a few of the townspeople have come together of their own accord, and undertaken to organize a Baptist or a Methodist or a Unitarian institution as an expression of the religious views which they hold in common. But even in this case, we have people going outside the community for help, and imposing upon the community an institution which nobody wants but themselves. The denominational church in any city or town is not only divisive, but dispersive, in its influence. It comes into a community, and tries to convert the people to some particular and peculiar brand of religious thought; and when it has done this in the case of a few people, it separates these people from their community, and annexes them to an outside and perhaps very alien organization. The members of a denominational church enjoy fellowship, not primarily with their fellow-townsmen whom they know, but with their fellow-Baptists or Episcopalians whom they do not know. As a Unitarian, I am associated not with my Methodist neighbor whom I see every day, and with whom I work intimately in community affairs, but with my fellow Unitarian in Minneapolis, or Moosejaw, or Kalamazoo, whom I never see through the period of an entire lifetime, or perhaps occasionally and distantly meet at some church conference. The first allegiance of a denominational church is not to its community but to its denomination. This church, as a Unitarian church, has for ninety-four years enjoyed an intimacy with 25 Beacon Street, Boston, which it has never enjoyed with Madison Avenue and 35th Street, New York, our nearest church neighbor. The denominational church, as we can see, cuts right through the life of a community, and thus divides it instead of uniting it spiritually.

Now it is just this division, or rather dispersion, of religious life, which the Community Church, whether it works inside or outside of a denomination, seeks deliberately to avoid. The Community Church sets itself apart from all other churches as they exist today, primarily because it accepts as the basis of its organization no denomination of any kind, but simply and solely the community in which it stands. It comes into being not as something imposed upon a town from without, but as a natural outgrowth of the life of the town itself; and it represents not the peculiar ecclesiastical interests of an outside organization, but those universal human interests which hold the people of a town together as members of the same community. It holds the same relation to a town or city as any other public institution. When a new community is established, and the citizens come together to organize their common life, they establish a public school, a public library, a social centre; and some time also they are going to establish a public, or community, church. All of these institutions, the church exactly like the school, belong to the people, serve the people, and express the democratic aspirations of the people. It is because of its identification in this way with the general interests of community life, that the Community Church is called a *community church,* and not a Baptist or Presbyterian or Methodist church. It is a community church because it draws its life directly and exclusively from the community in which it is placed. It is a community church because it turns back into the community, in forms of leadership and public service, the life which it has thus developed. Its influence is not dispersive, but concentrative. It gathers all the people of a single community into a single organization of this community, and dedicates them primarily to the welfare of this community. Its members pledge no allegiance, and seek no end, but that of the community in which they live. Of course, as the Community Church movement develops, there will be many community churches in many cities and towns, and in the larger cities, there will be different community churches in different neighborhoods; and all these churches will be certain to seek association with one another in some form of fellowship or brotherhood. But this fellowship will never become a denomination; will never seek to impose itself upon any community; and will never draw to itself that primary devotion of the individual member, which properly belongs to the community alone. The people of a neighborhood, gathered together in a church for work and worship, as they are now gathered together in a forum for discussion—this is the first picture of the Community Church which I would give you.

If we turn back now to the type of church with which we are ordinarily familiar, we will discover that a second characteristic which we recognize is that of its nature as a private corporation. The typical church stands in a community as the representative of a certain kind of theology, or a certain habit of worship, or even a certain spirit of point of view in matters religious. It invites all persons who agree with its doctrines, or accept its ritual, or sympathize with its general spirit, to join its ranks, and thus puts on a fine appearance of democratic hospitality. But those who cannot, or will not, accept the particular thing for which the church stands apart from all other churches, are never received; and thus it includes within itself only a fraction of the whole community. The ministers of these churches talk a great deal about religion as a universal instinct. They describe man as incurably religious, and human nature as moved by a kind of divine necessity toward God. But when they come to present this religion to the people through their church organizations, they define it in practically every case in particular and exclusive terms. These churches, in other words, are not public institutions at all, but private. They are parishes or families. Even in the most liberal, there are conditions of admission; and only those men and women who can qualify are received.

Now the Community Church distinguished itself from all other churches in the fact that it is genuinely a public institution. Like the public school, or the social centre, or the forum, it is open to everybody in the true spirit of democracy. If a man wants to be excluded, he must exclude himself. The Community Church, in other words, takes the claims of religion, that it is rooted deep in the soil of human nature, in a very serious way. It believes indeed that all men are religious. It is insistent that they crave for fellowship with their brothers on a religious basis. And it proposes to provide this fellowship by organizing an institution which shall be as wide as humanity, as deep as the soul, as free as the world of men. To be specific, the Community Church will receive members in the same way and to the same end that a community receives its inhabitants—on the basis, that is to say, of citizenship. Any man or woman who is a citizen of a community will by that fact also be a member of the church. As freely as he enters the town meeting and shares in the public business, so freely will he enter the town church, and share in the public worship. The Community Church is the community functioning religiously. It is democracy expressing itself in terms of moral and spiritual idealism. It is the people at work in the realm of their own souls. Not a private institution, belonging to a few who can agree together on a controversial issue, but a public institution belonging to all who would think and strive together for the common good —this is the second picture which I would present to you of the Community Church.

This brings me to a third point of definition! Most of the churches that we know today are identified with some kind of a creed, or statement of belief, which constitutes an essential part of their organized life. These churches plainly indicate their conviction that theology, to some degree or other, is a necessary constituent of religion. Most churches have elaborate creeds, and offer these as a condition of admission to their fellowship. In recent years, especially in the so-called liberal churches, these creeds have been done away with; but even here there is left in covenant, or bond of union, an affirmation of God which would exclude from spiritual association any member of the community who was an agnostic or an atheist. Even those radical churches, which have freed themselves of all theological bonds, have gone to the other extreme of setting up a structure of denial which is just as exclusive as any of the creeds of Christendom. The People's Churches, for example, were so dogmatic in their repudiation of every accepted doctrine of religion, that it was quite impossible for any conservative person to enjoy fellowship among their members. Either positively or negatively theology has intruded, and thus has made the church a partisan of orthodox, liberal, or radical interpretations of religious thought.

Now the Community Church divorces itself absolutely from theology. Neither the acceptance nor the denial of a creed is recognized as having any significance or interest. What a man believes, or does not believe, on highly controversial questions of theology, is a matter of no concern whatsoever to the church as a church. All this belongs properly to the life of the individual, but has no place of any kind in the life of the organization. What holds the members of the Community Church together is not identity of belief on any religious issue—not the doctrine of the soul, or the hope of immortality, or even the concept of a Divine Being; but the sense of common need, the desire for common welfare, the consciousness of membership one with another in all the things of life. If a man is a citizen of the community, he is by that fact a member of the church. It would be as absurd and unjust to shut him out because he is a materialist, or an atheist, or a theosophist, or a spiritualist, or a Holy Roller, as it would be to exclude him from society because he is a Republican, or a Socialist, or a Prohibitionist. The Community Church, like the democratic state, is all inclusive. Membership in the one, like citizenship in the other, is extended to all on the basis, not of ideas, but of human nature. Which means that the Community Church holds its members together not by a creed, however attenuated—not even by the first article of the creed, with everything else lopped off—but by a bond of union which is an expression of common purpose, of mutual fellowship in need and desire, of "love one for another" as comrades in our common life on earth!

This raises another question of great importance. Is the Community Church a Christian Church? The churches which we see about us are all Christian. Our orthodox brethren would deny to some of the liberal churches a free title to the Christian inheritance and tradition; but these liberal churches have never at any time accepted this denial. The churches, as we know them, are all Christian, at least in their own eyes, because they accept the teaching of Jesus and strive to inculcate the ideals of his life. In this sense, may I say, I am a Christian. I regard the Nazarene as the one Great Master of the art of human living, and know no moral and spiritual principles which are superior to those which he proclaimed. I beg therefore to be counted among his disciples. And yet it is my firm conviction that the Community Church must not, and indeed cannot be, a Christian Church. Just to the extent that it is faithful to its own ideal of the community as the unit of integration, must it escape from the trammels of Christianity. For the community has members who are not Christians. Here in our civic family are Jews, and Bahaists, and Hindus, and Mohammedans, and Buddhists. Shall the distinction between Episcopalians and Unitarians, between Catholics and Protestants, be denied; and this distinction between Christians and so-called pagans be recognized and acknowledged? If so, where is our community? If the non-Christian is fit to be a citizen of the state, why should he not also be fit to be a member of the church? What I see in Jesus, my Jewish brother sees in Isaiah, my Bahaist brother in Baha O'lla, my Mohammedan brother in Mohammed, my Buddhist brother in Buddha. But behind the prophet, who means the most to each, is the same great ideal of truth and love; and we unite, if not in the person, at least in the spirit of which the person is the incarnation. Our Community Church therefore must be more than a Christian church. It must be an institution of universal religion—its altar a "holy of holies" for all faiths. Here in Manhattan, for example, can there be any question that the Community Church would necessarily be a combination of Hebrew Synagogue and Christian Church? And would it be the Community Church's least or greatest claim to public favor that it had healed at last the tragic separation between Gentile and Jew?

These, now, are some of the principles and purposes which distinguish the Community Church from the ordinary churches, which we see about us. Is it not possible to summarize this contrast and thus indicate all that is involved in the revolutionary character of this institution, by stating that the Community Church accepts the idea that the community and not the church is the central thing—that the community is the evidence of God's presence, the repository of God's truth, the realization of God's Kingdom on the earth? The typical church of our time, and every time, regards itself as a holy thing, a basic thing. It thinks of itself as "coming down out of heaven from God," and thus bringing revelation and salvation unto men. Our more liberal churches today, of course, do not speak of it in this way. But these churches still believe that they have something indispensable to give to the community, that men and women should come to them for instruction and conversion, that without them the world would be without the right kind of religion and therefore without redemption. To some extent or other every one of these churches, orthodox and liberal alike, are guilty of the fundamental blasphemy of believing that society was made for the church and not the church for society.

Now the Community Church does the revolutionary thing of avoiding this exaltation of itself. It makes the community the primary thing, and the church the secondary. Emerson once said that the Bible might be destroyed from cover to cover, without loss; for in such a case, men would set themselves down and write it again. Similarly may we say of the churches, that they also might be destroyed, without loss; for if this were done, the people would straightway rear new churches to give voice to their needs, and service to their ideals. Indeed, it is just this thing which the people are now doing in this new movement of the Community Church. This movement is the creative spirit of democracy entering into the chaotic field of religion. It is the people proclaiming their power, recognizing that God is "in the midst of them," building anew tall altars on which this God may be worshipped and made known. The Community Church is proud of the fact that it comes not "down out of heaven," but up from the earth. It rejoices in the discovery that its roots are deep in the soil of human hearts. It acknowledges that it is from the people that it draws its life, and to the people, therefore, that it must make return. The Community Church is rightly named. It is not primarily a church at all; rather is it the community in spiritual action. Like every other democratic institution—the state, the school, the social centre—it is the work of men's hands, the instrument of men's hearts, the expression of men's souls. Not the people for the church, but the church for the people—this is the secret of this new hope.

Such are the principles of the Community Church. It remains now, this morning, only to speak of the organization of this church. For this I have left little time. But it is just as well, for the organization is so simple that it needs but the briefest telling.

The Community Church, of course, will be democratic to the core. Just as all persons are admitted to its fellowship on the basis of citizenship in the community, so all persons will have equal opportunity and authority in its management. There will be no priestly or churchly offices of any kind—no bishops or presbyters, or deacons, or elders. There will be no division between church and society, except as such division may be made inevitable by the laws of the state. There will simply be the one body of the congregation inside the church, as there is the one body of the citizenship outside the church. This body will be organized on the basis of the town meeting idea; it will elect its own officers, transact its own business, discuss and determine its own policy and practice. In one word, Congregationalism, which is democracy in religion, will be the principle of organization.

In all problems affecting the procedure of the Community Church, the rule of the majority will of course prevail. There may be vital difference of opinion, for example, on the matter of public worship. Shall this be formal or informal, ritualistic or non-ritualistic? Some community churches will

decide one way, and some community churches another, according to the temper of the people in any one community. It is probable, however, that most community churches will establish a certain minimum of public observance upon which practically everybody can agree; and then, in accordance with the democratic principle of the rights of minorities, give full and free opportunity to every group of persons who acknowledge particular rites and ceremonies, to have their own services in their own way. It is improbable, for example, that the Lord's Supper would have place in the regular public services of the Community Church; but this sacrament would be administered by the church as often as necessary for all those who desire it as a part of their religious life.

The support of the Community Church will be democratic, which means that it will be established on the basis of individual voluntary subscription. That ancient abomination, the pew rental system, will be swept out of the Community Church, as Jesus swept the money changers out of the Temple. It is by no means one of the least advantages of the Community Church that it will end forever the separation in the Lord's house between rich and poor, between those able and those not able, to pay! Money will be still further subordinated by placing the direction of the church in the hands of a popularly elected board of managers, with a financial committee acting in place of the usual independent board of trustees.

Lastly, the Community Church will have an equipment adequate to community needs. Its church house, for offices and social activities, will be as important a building as its place of worship—its theatre and assembly hall as impressive as its sanctuary. Its ministry will be what I like to call a "faculty ministry." There will be not one man worked to death, and degraded to the indignities of a Jack-of-all trades, but a group of men, each one trained to one profession—preaching, religious education, social work—and each one a leader in his department. The Community Church therefore will be what almost no church has ever been in the past—efficient. It will be equipped for the great task of the Kingdom!

Such in principle and organization, is the Community Church. Its story is as yet only half told, for there still remains the account which I shall give next Sunday of its message and its work. But I have said enough, I trust, to indicate what the Community Church is in itself, and to convince you that it is the solution of our present-day religious difficulties. The old church is dead. The new democratic spirit of our age has made this traditional institution as impossible as the Medieval church. A new Renaissance makes inevitable a new Reformation. And the church of this Reformation will be the church not of any man, or group of men, but of the people. Democracy is coming at last into its own, in religion as in politics and industry; and the church of democracy is none other than this which we are calling the Community Church.

(*To be continued.*)

CONTRIBUTED

Justice or Compromise?

Many of the editors of our great journals seem to have undergone a great chastening of the spirit since the days when we read so much about the war that was waged for Democracy and Justice. There has been a noticeable change of late in the tone of their writings, so noticeable indeed that at times we have rubbed our startled eyes, scarcely daring to trust what we have read. Frequently of late we have noticed in the New York and Chicago daily newspapers many editorial doubts as to the justice peace will bring, and the kind of democracy which the delegates in Paris are putting into practice. One great newspaper tells us that the peace treaty can not help but bring many wars; another well-known editor has grave doubts of the future of democracy. All this is very sad, most discouraging to those whose high spirit was fed upon the rich editorial fare of pre-armistice days.

It is just as well that even the editorial spirit should undergo chastening experience now and then. The *New York Times* editorial page is now sometimes an intellectual feast of quite a high order, though all the war spice, the feverish moralizing, is gone. It is now better fare, not nearly so indigestible. In an article in a recent issue we were treated to a dissertation upon Politics and Dogma,—a strange combination of terms—which reminds us of the class of editorial writing of the best of London's papers before the days of Northcliffe. But in this article the editor heroically attempted an impossible task: that of striving to reconcile compromise with justice. We gather from the article that justice has suffered defeat, conquered again by our old enemy, compromise. Justice having fallen, truth has also been overthrown. The editor says:

> Truth is mighty and will prevail, but the cost of making it prevail at once must be reckoned with in these high matters. For the time being Truth stoops, to conquer later on. At least the Conference must hope that it will conquer, must be resolved that it shall conquer, otherwise the League of Nations goes by the board altogether.

Here is the whole trouble, expressed in very frank terms, of truth conflicting with the ambitions of governments. It is just that cost of making it prevail that is always reckoned with by the statesman, for is he not a statesman inasmuch as he reckons that cost correctly? No one will deny the fact that European statesmen were perfectly willing to subscribe to President Wilson's fourteen points when it was a question of bringing hostilities to a close, and no one will deny the fact that there was not one statesman in Europe who supported the fourteen points believing that they would ever be accepted as the basis of a peace treaty. The terms of the armistice laid down by statesmen, accepted by the Teutonic powers, were the terms which brought hostilities to a close, but these terms were not those which the military powers of the Allies exacted from their enemies. It seems an impossible task for anyone to attempt to apply the principles of justice and truth to these conditions. All history is nothing more or less than a candid exposure of the futility of imagining justice to be preferable to expediency when diplomatists gather to share the spoils of war. It is no different today. Expediency has beaten justice in Paris at every turn.

Now, if we are to accept the conclusions which some of our editors have reached, we must pin our faith to the axiom that "truth is mighty and will prevail." Those of us who have faith in a league of all nations cannot help but feel extremely discouraged when we think that the league will depend entirely on the might of truth for its existence, that same truth that has been so shamefully blasted in Paris. Still, faith is about all that is left to us, and in the world chaos faith is about the only straw to which we may cling. The editor of the *Times* tells us that the difficulties the statesmen in Paris had to consider were dealt with by the rule of expediency, and he adds:

> In some later time, we are confident, after a period of international control, Fiume will go to the Jugo-slavs, to whom it belongs; Japan will relinquish her hold upon Shantung. To that she is pledged, her honor is engaged, and so freely and publicly that there can be no doubt of her keeping her engagement. Four hundred million Chinamen cannot be sacrificed to the ambition of Japan. That would put Truth, not merely in the second place, but on the scaffold.

If the expense of making mighty truth prevail now is too great for our statesmen, what justification have we for thinking that truth will be any cheaper at the end of ten, twenty, or fifty years? None whatever. Truth will always be far too expensive for diplomatists, for truth means justice, and justice in international affairs is not now, and has never been, the concern of the chancelleries of Europe.

Compromise is the best we can expect so long as we leave these great questions in the hands of a few men who will not realize human relationships. The war has not in the slightest degree changed the minds of European statesmen. The chancelleries of the Old World used the same old jargon, seek the same old system, and work to the same old formulas. The *London Times,* nearly two years before this war began, said:

Who, then, makes war? The answer is to be found in the Chancelleries of Europe, among the men who have too long played with human lives as pawns in a game of chess, who have become so enmeshed in formulas and the jargon of diplomacy that they have ceased to be conscious of the poignant realities with which they trifle. And thus will war continue to be made, until the great masses who are the sport of professional schemers and dreamers say the word which will bring, not eternal peace, for that is impossible, but a determination that wars shall be fought only in a just and righteous and vital cause.

Now is this not a fair statement of what prevails today?

Perhaps common men and women will some day realize that justice is preferable to compromise. The common people may some day set to work, without violence or force, and in their might make justice prevail. In that day they will not stop to reckon the cost, for they will earnestly strive to put an end to war, and all the treaties of compromise which have used "human lives as pawns in the game of chess."

RICHARD CLAUGHTON.

News from Europe

False Exchange and Its Cost.

Colonel Josiah C. Wedgwood, M. P., writing to the London *Daily News,* has some timely comments to make on international finance. He says:

Our exports are too few and our imports too many. We have sold all our American securities to pay for imports. We have no more gold to export wherewith to pay. Our debt to America is enormous.

This would, in course of time, right itself naturally. The exchange would "go against us": that is, a smaller sum in dollars would buy a pound's worth of goods. But, by means of ever-growing credits provided by Messrs. Morgan for the British government and British people, the exchange is being artificially kept at 4.76 dollars to the £. If the government would cease to raise fresh credits in America the exchange might drop to 3.70 dollars to the £. This would provide a natural stimulus to our export trade, a natural check to our imports. It would do exactly what the Board of Trade is trying to do by licenses and prohibitions.

Take the first effect of a fall in exchange on exports. The American consumer would find his dollar go 25 per cent further in this country than it does at present. He would have 25 per cent more reasons for buying from us. The American investor would be able to invest his capital here 25 per cent cheaper than before. We want purchasers, and we want capital. Therefore the change would benefit the export trade.

Imports would be reduced. The goods—food and cotton and machinery—that we buy from the States would cost us 25 per cent more. The prohibition on the investment of British capital abroad might be taken off; no one would want to pay 25 per cent above present prices in order to buy stocks and shares in America. I should add that it is not certain that cotton would cost us 25 per cent more, for the Americans have to sell in any case, and must take what they can get.

Considering merely the export and import trades, it may be said that the disadvantage to the latter almost balances the advantage to the former; that there is little case for a change. But now the two vital reasons for the change to normal conditions appear.

Suppose I want to buy £1,000 of American cotton. I go to the bank or bill discounter with my £1,000 check to transfer it to America. I ask for 4,760 dollars for it. He tells me he can only give me 3,700 dollars. At the present day I do *not* accept his offer; I go to a government department, which considers and approves my purchase as being "in the interests of society." He then gives me a piece of paper to Morgans of New York, on which in due course Messrs. Morgan pay the full 4,760 dollars. Some day, when we have to pay interest to Messrs. Morgan, and as long as the exchange stands at 3,700, the British public will begin to realize that they are paying over 1,000 dollars on that transaction—that they are giving a 25 per cent bonus to the importer in this country. And ever as our debt grows, as our exports diminish, and as our imports increase, the exchange gets worse and worse—3.50, 3 dollars, 2½ dollars—where is it to stop?—and the British taxpayer makes up the difference.

Seen in this way the course pursued by the British Treasury appears somewhat short-sighted, and manifestly unjust to the community. But the fact is the case is really far, far worse. The British government, in addition to raising credit for the British importer, is also guaranteeing the French and Italian importer. We are artificially and by use of British credit keeping the lira at 30 to the £, and the £ at 4.76 dollars. The £ is only worth 3.70 dollars, but the lira—the lira which Italian importers now exchange with America at 30—4.76 to the dollar—may, for all one can tell, be really worth only 60 to the £. We are, indeed, giving the lira in America perhaps 2½ times its real value. For every £1,000 of food that Italy gets from America the British taxpayer may, if the Italian government fails to meet its obligations, have to pay nearly £2,000. This is the road to British bankruptcy.

What is going to happen? Surely this financial "Rake's Progress" must come to an end. Or if it continue the business of bolstering up bankruptcy, will it mean the enslavement of the peoples of the world under a financial tyranny more cruel than that of any political one? Lord D'Abernon told the House of Lords that he was convinced, and could not state too strongly his belief, that 80 per cent of the present industrial troubles, and our Bolshevism, are due to this enormous displacement in the value of money.

How the Blockade Works.

Few people in America have realized the awful terror of the blockade. The report of General Smuts, and that of the Swiss Red Cross doctors, of conditions in Austria-Hungary make all propaganda atrocity stories mild reading. We do not wish to harrow our readers, but the following references to the blockade made by the Parliamentary correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* reveal not only the shocking brutality of the policy but also the stupendous stupidity of its authors:

From information from responsible sources we know now that even the children of the rich are suffering from famine diseases, while the children of the poor have long been weakened and undersized and a prey to constant disease.

The effect of the blockade since the armistice has been terrible in ways that one hardly considers. In the hospitals of Budapest, for instance, a city which is supposed to be best off, the lack of all cotton and linen materials and the lack of india rubber sheets has meant that women are being confined on the same mattresses in turn without any sheets. They go home and in many cases die of cold. The infant mortality is, of course, very high. Even with rich Austrian families who escaped to Switzerland the children are found dressed in paper, and miserably dressed at that.

Another thing about the blockade is that anyone entering Switzerland from the German or Austrian sides have all their

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

THE HUNDREDTH WALT WHITMAN ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF FELLOWSHIP OF CHICAGO.

The annual celebration in honor of the poet's birth will be held Saturday evening, May 31, 1919, at the Morrison Hotel (A floor ball room), southeast corner Madison and Clark streets. Dinner at 6 p. m. and meeting at 8 p. m. promptly. Dinner and celebration, two dollars, or separate admission to celebration, fifty cents.

Addresses by the following speakers:

"The Literary Value of Whitman," by Llewellyn Jones, literary editor of the Chicago *Evening Post*.

"The Revolutionary Value of Whitman," by Horace J. Bridges, lecturer of the Chicago Ethical Society.

"The Spiritual Value of Whitman," by Rev. Walter H. Macpherson, minister of the Universalist Church of Joliet, Ill.

"The Human Side of Whitman," by Clarence Darrow, lawyer, writer and lecturer.

"Sidelights on Whitman," by Harriet Monroe, editor of *Poetry Magazine*.

"The Influence of Whitman on British Thought," by Francis Neilson, former M. P., publicist, writer and lecturer.

Reservations can be made by addressing Dr. Morris Lychenheim, 142—39 S. State Street. Telephone Central 2223.

First Unitarian Society, Spokane, Wash.—*William D. Simonds, Minister.* Thirty-seven new members have recently joined the society; fifty people have signed cards as members though not yet prepared to apply for full membership. The ideal of this society is Organization with Liberty, the freedom of the individual conscience sacredly guarded, while the strength and stability of a wise union of forces is attained. Unity extends congratulations to this progressive society and greetings to Mr. Simonds, the friend of many years.

"TOO NEAR EUROPE."

Now that the war is over and the passions it excited are dying down, it would be interesting to know how far Americans have got back to the speculative attitude they used to maintain towards world affairs before they entered the war. The indifference of the Middle West to world politics used to make men in the Eastern States furious, while their own excitement was regarded by the Middle West with contemptuous amusement. The violence of the controversy helped both sides. The Middle West did get some idea at last that things even in their territory would not be quite the same after the war, and if the East had had nobody to argue with they would never have got half so clear an idea of the future.

Looking back over my notes of that period I find scraps of conversation that show how interested Americans were in the world that was to confront them, how inevitable their part in world affairs seemed to them to have become, and how little the prospect pleased them.

One such chat is typical. I had been talking to a prominent business man in Boston of the Washington tradition and the idea of the League of Nations.

"Entangling alliances!" he said. "After this there won't be an alliance anywhere that we are not entangled in. Whether we get into this scrap or not, we are in the pussy-foot business after it good and hard. Europe's a T. N. T. mill, and it's next door. We've got to take shares in it, but we feel like going to the meetings in a fireproof suit."

"You mean you will have to take more interest in diplomatic affairs?"

"Wasn't it a German who said war was a continuation of politics? If he'd said politics were a continuation of war there'd have been more to it."

"But American diplomats have made great reputations."

"Maybe, but before this they were never actually at the table when the grab game was proceeding. All they had to do was to stand around and butt in when somebody turned up Old Monroe. We've come to think a whole lot of the guys in your Foreign Office. We sorter feel we'd just hate to be up against what the Germans found themselves up against in July, 1914."

"The Foreign Office would be glad to hear you say that. They don't get much praise at home."

"That may be. A prophet is not without honor save, etc. I've heard it said that President Wilson has more following in Manchester than he has in Boston. On this side we reckon your Foreign Office delivered the goods all the time. I hear you choose them mostly from the great families."

"Not altogether, but they're not chosen by competitive examination."

"Well, on results, I guess a feudal scion in a two-gallon tile is a mighty good outfit for a diplomatic drummer."

"Surely you don't think Americans lack subtlety?"

"We are brought up on publicity, 'pitiless publicity,' and it's a poor training for diplomatists."

"In any case, your men would never take a hand in the 'grab game,' as you call it?"

"No, but somebody's sure to go getting his ambitions mixed up with the moral elevation of a backward tribe, or feeling the call of his oppressed brethren across a frontier. Somebody's sure to start something, and whatever it is we're interested."

"But that's just the sort of thing a League of the World would prevent, is it not?"

"It might, but the grab game is very old, and the League's not here yet. When I see military critics get calling the next man's patch the glacis of his patch, or his bridgehead, or his corridor from somewhere to somewhere else, it seems to me that new varieties of the old game are about to be placed on the market."

"You have no faith, then, in the possibility of a League?"

"A League would have my complete confidence. It would not count for much when it was young, and it would go bad when it grew old. But it's America's only hope. I figure right now, Constantinople's on Long Island Sound, and Przemysl's as far away as Fall River. The tired millions of Europe are no longer separated from America by the vasty deep. They're sitting on the verandah, and the only thing America can do is to call the cop."

"The world certainly does seem to be closing in to your continent on both sides."

"Yes, the Near East's too near and the Far East's not far enough. The world is getting smaller every day, but the trouble is the people in it are not getting any bigger."

J. W. in the Manchester Guardian.

---

belongings stamped when they come over the frontier, and they cannot take even an unstamped handkerchief back with them. One Austrian charity official who had a pair of gloves in his pocket which he omitted to have stamped was not allowed to take them back with him. They cannot even take a piece of chocolate with them. There have been considerable stocks of grain and flour of a lower quality bought by the Swiss at high prices, but with the armistice new food came in, and they were willing to sell on moderate terms to the Germans and Austrians, but were not allowed. It is only now after five months that they are being allowed to send it out of the country, and some of the food has become unfit for eating. The blockade, too, keeps thread and hundreds of small necessaries from getting into enemy countries, and lack of these things makes their inferior clothes go to bits all the quicker.

The conditions in the Rhine provinces, where our soldiers are, blind many of us to the horrible realities, particularly in Austria. Plenty of information is available of the urgent necessity of private and public effort if a generation of children is not to be wiped out.

It is all so disheartening—there seems to be no end to the revolting business of this war. The youth of Europe is wiped out because of the criminal ambitions of European diplomatists and concessionaires and now the soldiers' war is over, another, of sheer revenge, is begun in which a generation of children is in grave danger of being wiped out by the authors of the blockade

Francis Neilson.

A LONDON OPINION

Spoken March 23, 1919

"I regard the Christian Register as the best religious paper published."

Dr. J. Fort Newton, noted preacher of the famous City Temple, London.

A Journal of
Liberal Christianity With a World Outlook

Will You Send for a Free Copy?

Subscription $3.00. Also club rates.

The Christian Register
6 Beacon Street - Boston

1,400 JOBS TO CHOOSE FROM

Young or old, man or woman, boy or girl, here is a descriptive story of 1,400 live occupations you may work at in the U. S., with instructions in sensible self-analysis which will show you how to pick out that for which you are physically and temperamentally best fitted. To get the right start in life, buy a copy of the new book,

How to Choose the Right Vocation

By HOLMES W. MERTON, Vocational Counselor

It will show you how to weigh and judge yourself and your possibilities and how to select the occupation in which your talents will bring you the greatest amount of success and profit. You will also learn from it how to judge and instruct others, how to select employees, etc. $1.50 net; by mail $1.62. *Send for it to-day!*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago

WHEN BUYING BOOKS OF LIBERAL RELIGION

Do not forget Dr. J. T. Sunderland's

RISING JAPAN, $1.25
THE ORIGIN OF THE BIBLE, $1.20
OH, TO BE RICH AND YOUNG! $1.00
THE SPARK IN THE CLOD (Religion and Evolution) 80 Cents

ORDER from the UNITARIAN BOOK ROOM
25 Beacon Street BOSTON

Advance Roofing and Sheet Metal Works

INCORPORATED

FRANK R. PRIEVE, Pres.
4830-32 Cottage Grove Ave.
Phone Oakland 3776

Sky-Lights and Sheet Metal Works. Gravel, Slate and Metal Roofing

FOR ANY MINISTER about to retire owing to failing health the purchase of an annuity forms an ideal testimonial.

For details apply
E. BASIL LUPTON
10 Humboldt St., Cambridge, Mass.
Agent for leading American and British Life Offices

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

"The Ambitious Woman in Business"

Here is a book for every woman who works and every one expecting to work. If you are in business, whether you work in an office or factory, whether at a desk, behind a counter, or at a machine, you need the advice and information in this book. Eleanor Gilbert, the author, gives you, from a woman's view-point, the practical knowledge that long experience and deep study of business have given her.

SOME OF THE THINGS THIS BOOK TELLS YOU

How to fit yourself better for your position; How to increase your earning capacity; How to secure a raise; How and why to learn more about your work.

These and many other subjects are treated in a simple, practical way that makes them of immense value to every woman who wants to command a better position and a larger salary. Contains also much that is of great interest to every employer of women.

Cloth bound, 403 pp. Illus. with photos and charts. Price $1.50; by mail $1.62.

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago

Schumann & Company

CLEANERS OF
Fancy Gowns and Kid Gloves

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
All Departments

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

GREGG SCHOOL

6 North Michigan Avenue
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

¶A select school of shorthand, typewriting, and allied business subjects.

¶Its courses of study are comprehensive, thorough, resultful, preparing graduates for positions as stenographers and secretaries, court reporters, commercial teachers, and in the Civil Service.

¶Day and evening sessions all the year. Students may begin any week and advance according to individual ability.

¶Gregg graduates hold positions of trust and responsibility with the leading business concerns and professional men of Chicago and elsewhere. We receive more calls than we have graduates available.

¶Call at office, write, or telephone (Randolph 6040) for a copy of our catalogue fully explaining the many exclusive advantages enjoyed by our students.